

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/791,024 | Applicant(s) HAM ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Tiffany A. Fetzner | Art Unit 2859 | |

All Participants:

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(2) David L. Barnes Reg. No. 47, 407.

Date of Interview: 28 September 2005

Status of Application: RCE filed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1-7, 9-14, 19, 20

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative because the claims had numerous grammatical, singular/ plural problems, did not properly reflect the changes of applicant's July 18th 2005 amendment, and the examiner attempted to request the location of where the amended features were found in the original specification. A list of proposed claim corrections to clean up formal matters in the dependent claims was proposed, but the examiner was informed that the current representative had inherited the case from a different representative and so could not provide the location of the original specification support at this time. The examiner was told to go ahead and send out the 112 first office action, so that the attorney would have more time to resolve the pending issues. A copy of the proposed corrections to the dependent claims, if the amendments to the independent claim from the July 18th 2005 amendment can be supported by applicant, are attached to the office action to which this paper is attached:.